

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 09/586,907 06/05/2000 Rajesh G. Shakkarwar 0100.0000370 9317 EXAMINER 24228 7590 08/13/2004 MARKISON & RECKAMP, PC VAUGHAN, MICHAEL R PO BOX 06229 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER WACKER DR CHICAGO, IL 60606-0229 2131

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/586,907	SHAKKARWAR, RAJESH G.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael R Vaughan	2131	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 13 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.			
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]			
 a)			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:			
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);			
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or			
(d) \(\square\) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.			
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).			
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)			
10. Other:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	EMMANUELL MO PRIMARY EXAMIL A/U 2/36	DISE NER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments presented are not persuasive to the Examiner. Most of the arguments presented were already presented in the previous office action filed 3-24-04. Examiner again considered those arguments and the arguments presented in the After Final office action filed 7-13-04. The Examiner maintains that the references cited as prior art meet the limitations of the claimed invention.